



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,782	01/05/2001	Yoon Kean Wong	PALM-3532.US.P	3206

7590 02/26/2004

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Third Floor  
Two North Market Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

CHEN, CHONGSHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

10

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,782

Applicant(s)

WONG, YOON KEAN

Examiner

Chongshan Chen

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-12,14-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-12,14-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation "third list" in claims 1, 8 and 15, limitation g, is not disclosed in the specification. The limitation "fourth list" in claims 2, 9 and 16 is not disclosed in the specification. Claims 3-5, 7, 10-12, 14, 17-19 and 21 are dependent on rejected claims 1, 8 and 15.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 1 December 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments regarding the references do not disclose "displaying a second list comprising sort instruction stored in said sort table, wherein said second list comprising a sort field for each of said different categories including said first sort field for said first category type; ... receiving an indication from said user that selects said first sort field; ... in response ..., displaying a third list comprising sort fields that can be used instead of said first sort

Art Unit: 2172

field, wherein said user can replace said first sort field with a sort field selected from said third list" have been considered but are not persuasive. The applicant describes the invention is a method and system that "provide category based sort and display ... For instance, person A may want business contacts to be sorted by company name, while personal contacts are sorted by last name but family contacts are sorted by first name ..." (specification page 4, line 17 – page 5, line 18). AddressPro discloses the user is allowed to choose any field to be the main sorting & display field, and the user may choose any field to be the second sort & display field. The user may now select different sorting schemes and different phone view fields for different categories, and then by changing categories you get different sorting and viewing possibilities. For example I choose the "last, first" sorting scheme and "phone1" view field for my "personal" category and "company, last" scheme with no phone view field for my "business" category (AddressPro, 1, Overview, 6.2, Changing the displaying and sort order of the address list). The "personal" category and "business" category in AddressPro are the claimed different categories, while the different sorting schemes are the claimed first, second, third, fourth list comprising sort instructions.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2172

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14-17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al. ("Shakib", 5,752,025) in view of AddressPro v4.0 ("AddressPro", Copyright January 2000 by ZingWare).

As per claim 1, Shakib discloses in an electronic device having a database of records of different categories, a method of displaying information comprising the steps of:

receiving an indication from a user that selects a first category type of said different category types (Shakib, col. 3, lines 38-64);

indexing a sort table with said first category type to obtain a first sort field for said first category type, said table associating each category type of said different categories with its own sort field (Shakib, col. 7, lines 1-4, "As mentioned previously, a major advantage of using a sorted index 12 is that other indices may be created using different fields or a different order of fields as the sort keys");

sorting records of said first category type into an order that is determined according to said first sort field to produce a first list (Shakib, col. 4, lines 50-59, "one advantage of using indices for sorting the data records is that the same body of data may be categorized quite differently depending on which data fields are chosen as sort keys or the indices ...");

displaying a portion of said order on a display screen of said electronic device, wherein said displayed is formatted automatically with information from said sort field on the left-hand side of display screen as view by said user, wherein by selecting sort filed said user controls said in which said records are displayed (Shakib, col. 3, lines 23-64).

Shakib does not explicitly teach wherein a sort field for each category type is under user control, where said first category type has a sort field different from that of another category

Art Unit: 2172

type, and displaying a second list comprising sort instruction stored in said sort table, wherein said second list comprises a sort field for each of said different categories including said first sort field for said first category type; receiving an indication from said user that selects said first sort field; display a third list comprising sort fields that can be used instead of said first sort field, wherein said user can replace said first sort field with a sort field selected from said third list. AddressPro discloses a sort field for each category type is under user control and where said first category type has a sort field different from that of another category type (AddressPro, 1, Overview, 6.2 Changing the display and sort order of the address list). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a category based sort in the system of Shakib in order to display information from different category in a user preferred fashion. This will allow the user to find information easily.

As per claim 2, Shakib and AddressPro teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose receiving another indication from said user that selects a second category type of said different category types; indexing said sort table with said second category type to obtain a second sort field for said second category type; sorting records of said second category type by said second sort field obtained to produce a fourth list; and displaying in list order a portion of said fourth list on said display screen (Shakib, col. 3, lines 23-64, col. 7, lines 1-4, AddressPro, page 3, 6.2 Changing the display and sort order of the address list).

Regarding to claim 3, Shakib and AddressPro teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose the electronic device is a palm-sized computer system (Shakib, col. 6, lines 22-23).

Regarding to claim 5, Shakib and AddressPro teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said database is a database of contact information comprising records each having fields defining a name, an address and a telephone number (AddressPro, page 3, 6.2 Changing the display and sort order of the address list).

As per claim 7, Shakib and AddressPro teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teach user depressing a designated button on said electronic device (AddressPro, 6.2 Changing the display and sort order of the address list).

Claims 8-10 and 15-17 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-3.

Claims 12 and 19 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 5.

Claims 14 and 21 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 7.

6. Claims 4, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al. ("Shakib", 5,752,025) in view of AddressPro v4.0 ("AddressPro", Copyright January 2000 by ZingWare) and further in view of Eagle (6,226,739).

As per claim 4, Shakib and AddressPro teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing the electronic device is a wireless telephone. Eagle discloses the electronic device is a wireless telephone (Eagle, col. 4, lines 4-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a category based sort in a wireless telephone in order to display information from

Art Unit: 2172

different category in a user preferred fashion in a wireless telephone. This will allow the wireless telephone user to find information easily.

Claims 11 and 18 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 4.

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is 703-305-8319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).




Art Unit: 2172

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703)305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 19, 2004

  
SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER